



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,639	02/13/2001	Francis J. Bensur	31599/200998	2775
826	7590	11/03/2003	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			MIGGINS, MICHAEL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	
DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003				

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/782,639

Applicant(s)

BENSUR, FRANCIS J.

Examiner

Michael C. Miggins

Art Unit

1772

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: ____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) ____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. Other: see attachment

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that the term "metallized" used in the present claims is not broad enough to read on Kunz's ceramic oxide coating which contains metal in at least smaller quantities. However, applicant uses the term "comprising" which does not exclude the inclusion of other elements. Applicant alleges that the term "metallized" is well known in the art and that the term "metallized" is understood to mean a film of essentially pure metal deposited on the film surface. However, applicant provides only one reference which describes the term "metallized" and even if applicant were to provide further evidence applicant uses the term "comprising" which does not exclude the inclusion of other elements such as metal oxides.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a film of essentially pure metal deposited on the film surface) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant has stated that it is improper for the examiner to substitute his own meaning for a term that already has an accepted meaning in the art. The examiner has substituted a meaning for a term that already has an accepted meaning in the art. Kunz teach a metallized film comprising metal oxides and pure metals and applicant uses the

term "comprising" which does not exclude the inclusion of other elements such as metal oxides. The fact that Kunz does not refer to his coating as metallized is not persuasive since Kunz teach a metallized film comprising metal oxides and pure metals and applicant uses the term "comprising" which does not exclude the inclusion of other elements such as metal oxides.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Miggins whose telephone number is (703) 305-0915. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday; 1:30-10:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pyon Harold can be reached on (703) 308-4251. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

MCM *MC*
October 29, 2003

Harold Pyon
HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1772

10/29/03